REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 9 are amended. Claims 1-15 are pending.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, at page 8, numbered paragraph 11, claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2003/0145336 to Matsuzaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,601,104 to Fallon, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,865,431 to Hirota, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,035,290 to Lyle. This rejection is respectfully traversed because the combination of the teachings of Matsuzaki, Fallon, Hirota and Lyle does not suggest:

> an external apparatus connecting part to connect to an external apparatus,
>
> a data receiving part to receive the video data and the user data provided from the computer body through the body connection part,
>
> a control part to display the video data received through the data receiving part to the display part and to output the user data to the external apparatus connected to the external storage apparatus connecting part,

as recited in independent claim 1.

Matsuzaki discusses an encryption transmission system including a computer 20 that transmits data to a display device 30. The display device 30 displays video data at a CRT unit 303 and transmits audio data to a speaker control unit 304, which causes a speaker 305 to emit audio information.

First, Matsuzaki does not discuss or suggest that the speaker 305 is an external storage apparatus and does not suggest that a control part outputs user data to an external storage apparatus. The speaker 305 is not external to the display device 30 and does not connect to the display device 30 by an external apparatus connecting part. In addition, while the Applicant understands that the speaker 305 is external to the CRT unit 303, the speaker 305 is not external to the display device 30, which is cited by the Examiner as corresponding to the display apparatus of claim 1. The CRT unit 303 does not include a body connection part to connect to a video connector of a computer body, does not include a data receiving part to receive video data, and does not include a control part to display the video data. The CRT unit 303 therefore

cannot be construed to correspond with the display apparatus, but can only be construed to correspond with a display part of a display apparatus. Thus, while the speaker 305 may be external to the CRT unit 303, Matsuzaki does not disclose that the speaker 305 is an external apparatus which is connected to an external apparatus connecting part of the display apparatus. The CRT unit 303 does not include an external apparatus connecting part to connect to the speaker 305. Therefore, the CRT unit 303 cannot be construed to be a display apparatus that includes an external apparatus connecting part to connect to an external apparatus.

Second, Matsuzaki does not discuss or suggest that a control part causes video data to be displayed and outputs user data to an external apparatus. In Matsuzaki, one control unit 302 outputs video data to a display and another control unit 304 outputs audio data to speakers 305. Again, the speakers 305 are not an external apparatus. Matsuzaki does not discuss or suggest that a control part of the display device 30 outputs both video data and user data.

In addition, amended claim 1 distinguishes that the external apparatus is an external storage apparatus, and the speaker 305 is not a storage apparatus.

Further, as conceded by the Examiner, Matsuzaki does not discuss or suggest video memory to temporarily store video data generated through a video processing part and a data transmitting part outputting video data temporarily stored in video memory. The Examiner indicates that Fallon makes up for the deficiencies in Matsuzaki. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Fallon discusses a display memory 1110, a display processor 1120 and an output memory 1130 that output to a display device. Fallon does not suggest that the display memory 1110 or the output memory 1130 temporarily store both video data and user data that were input from a hard disk. Also, as conceded by the Examiner, Fallon does not discuss or suggest that a video memory also temporarily stores user data stored in a hard disk, a data transmitting part that also outputs user data temporarily stored in the video memory, and a data receiving part that also receives user data provided from a computer body. The Examiner indicates that Hirota makes up for the deficiencies in Matsuzaki and Fallon. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Hirota discusses an internal construction of a reproduction apparatus that includes a RAM 3, an LCD 5 and a flash memory card 31 connected to the reproduction apparatus. Hirota discusses that a playlist stored in the flash memory card 31 is shown on the LCD panel 5. However, Hirota does not discuss or suggest that user data (i.e., a playlist) is output to an external apparatus. That the playlist stored in the memory card 31 is able to be displayed on the LCD 5 does not suggest that the playlist is output to an external storage apparatus.

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to combine the teachings of Hirota into the inventions of Matsuzaki and Fallon to suggest transmitting video data for display at a display part **and** outputting user data to an external apparatus. In Hirota, video can either be displayed at the LCD 5 or, separately, a playlist, for example, can be displayed at the LCD 5. Hirota does not suggest that both the video data can be displayed and a playlist can be output to an apparatus. If video data is displayed in Hirota, then the playlist is not able to be displayed. Also, as there is no distinction between the display part and an external apparatus, it is unclear as to how incorporating Hirota into the systems of Matsuzaki and Fallon would be suggestive of a display apparatus that includes a control part that is able to both display video data to a display part and also output user data to an external apparatus connected to an external apparatus connecting part of the display apparatus. In addition, the LCD 5 is not a storage apparatus.

Additionally, as conceded by the Examiner, Matsuzaki, Fallon and Hirota do not teach that user data is output to an external apparatus. The Examiner indicates that Lyle makes up for the deficiencies in Matsuzaki, Fallon and Hirota. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Lyle discusses that a transmitter 11 transmits encrypted data to a receiver 15, which is configured to decrypt the encrypted data. The receiver 15 can be a TV set, a portable MP3 player, an information kiosk, etc.

While Lyle does discuss that data is able to be received at an apparatus, Lyle does not discuss or suggest a control part of a display apparatus that outputs user data to an external apparatus that is connected to an external apparatus connecting part of a display apparatus. Lyle discusses only that an apparatus can receive data. However, Lyle does not discuss or suggest receiving user data from a control part of a display apparatus that is capable of both displaying video data to a display part and outputting user data to an external apparatus.

In addition, the motivation cited of "receiv[ing] user data in order for user to be able to use user data to control programs [sic]" does not suggest why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to combine the teachings of Matsuzaki, Fallon, Hirota and Lyle, specifically to teach a control part of a display apparatus to display video data and to output user data to an external apparatus connected to the display apparatus. Neither Matsuzaki, Fallon, Hirota or Lyle suggest that a control part of a display apparatus can both display video data and output user data to an external apparatus. With particular respect to Hirota, Hirota only discusses that the user data from the flash memory card 31 is capable of being displayed on the LCD 5. Thus, there is no indication from Hirota or the motivation cited as to why both video data and user data

would be transmitted to a single device. In particular, if the playlist in Hirota is displayed on the LCD 5, then video data cannot be displayed. If video data is displayed in Hirota on the LCD 5, then user data cannot also be output to an external storage apparatus.

While the references cited do discuss that video data is able to be transmitted for display and do discuss that user data is able to be transmitted to a device, none of the references, either alone or in combination, suggest that one control part is able to do both. In contrast, the present invention of claim 1 particularly discusses that one control part of a display apparatus can cause video data to be displayed and also output user data to an external storage apparatus. The motivation cited of "receiv[ing] user data in order for user to be able to use user data to control programs [sic]" suggests only that user data would be saved to an external apparatus, but not why user data would be saved to an external apparatus and, from the same control part, display video data to a display part. The motivation cited must be enough to lead one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the reference teachings. The motivations cited by the Examiner do not suggest why one of ordinary skill in the art would cause both video data and user data, which are both temporarily stored in the memory, to be transmitted to a display apparatus, and then cause a control part of a display apparatus to both display the video data and output the user data to an external apparatus. Again, merely showing that audio data, distinct from video data, would be played through speakers does not suggest why user data would be transmitted along with video data so that the user data could be output to an external storage apparatus that is connected to the display apparatus.

Therefore, as the combination of the teachings of Matsuzaki, Fallon, Hirota and Lyle does not suggest, in particular, a display apparatus that includes "an external apparatus connecting part to connect to an external apparatus, a data receiving part to receive the video data and the user data provided from the computer body through the body connection part, a control part to display the video data received through the data receiving part to the display part and to output the user data to the external apparatus connected to the external storage apparatus connecting part," as recited in amended independent claim 1, and as the numerous motivations cited do not suggest why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to combine Matsuzaki, Fallon, Hirota and Lyle, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. For example, claim 5 recites that "the display apparatus has a

buffer temporarily storing the user data received through the data receiving part." Therefore, claims 2, 5 and 6 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Matsuzaki, Fallon, Hirota, Lyle, Fandrianto, Johnson, Charton and Kato

In the Office Action, at pages 11-13, numbered paragraphs 16-19, claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Matsuzaki, Fallon, Hirota, Lyle, U.S. Patent No. 5,982,459 to Fandrianto, U.S. Patent No. 6,593,972 to Johnson, U.S. Patent No. 5,621,792 to Charton and U.S. Patent No. 6,939,177 to Kato. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, the combination of the teachings of Matsuzaki, Fallon, Hirota, and Lyle does not suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Fandrianto, Johnson, Charton and Kato fail to make up for the deficiencies in the combination of the teachings of Matsuzaki, Fallon, Hirota, and Lyle. Also, the motivations cited do not suggest combining the references. Therefore, independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon.

Claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. For example, claim 3 recites that "the TMDS transmitter comprises RGB data output pins, and compresses the user data and the video data provided from the video memory in a predetermined ratio to output a compressed user and video data through the respective RGB data output pins." Therefore, claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Matsuzaki, Lyle and Hirota

In the Office Action, at page 14, numbered paragraph 20, claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki in view of Lyle, and further in view of Hirota. This rejection is respectfully traversed because the combination of the teachings of Matsuzaki, Lyle and Hirota does not suggest "providing an external apparatus connecting part in the display apparatus; transmitting data to the display apparatus through the video connector; and displaying the video data of a transmitted data as a picture and outputting the user data of the transmitted data to an external **storage** apparatus connected to the external apparatus connecting part," as recited in amended independent claim 9. As discussed above, even

combining the teachings of Matsuzaki, Lyle and Hirota does not suggest both displaying video data of transmitted data as a picture and outputting user data of the transmitted data to an external storage apparatus connected to an external apparatus connecting part of a display apparatus. None of the references, alone or in combination, suggest that a picture is caused to be displayed and user data is also outputted to an external storage apparatus. Further, neither Matsuzaki, Lyle nor Hirota discuss or suggest that transmitted data is both video data and user data and that the transmitted data comprises both types of data. Therefore, as the combination of the teachings of Matsuzaki, Lyle and Hirota does not suggest all the features of independent claim 9, and as the motivations cited do not suggest why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to combine Matsuzaki, Hirota and Lyle, claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 depends directly from independent claim 9 and includes all the features of independent claim 9, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. For example, claim 10 recites "compressing the user data and the video data according to a TMDS-based digital data transmission standard, before transmitting the data from the computer body to the display apparatus." Therefore, claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the references relied for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Matsuzaki, Hirota, Lyle, Johnson, Charton, and Kato

In the Office Action, at page 15, numbered paragraphs 23-25, claims 11, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Matsuzaki, Lyle, Johnson, Charton, and U.S. Patent No. 6,939,177 to Kato. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above with respect to independent claim 9, the combination of Matsuzaki and Lyle fails to discuss all the features of independent claim 9. Johnson, Charton, and Kato fail to make up for the deficiencies in Matsuzaki and Lyle. Therefore, independent claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Claims 11, 12, and 14 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 9 and include all the features of claim 9, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. For example, claim 11 recites, "extracting the data; and separating an extracted data into the video data and the user data." Therefore, 11, 12, and 14 patentably distinguish over the references

relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Matsuzaki and Hirota

In the Office Action, at page 16, numbered paragraph 26, claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki, in view of Hirota. This rejection is respectfully traversed because the combination of the teachings of Matsuzaki and Hirota does not suggest "a display unit, which is connected to the processing unit via a video connector, and which is connected to the external storage unit via an external storage unit connector, to display the video data **and** to transmit the user data to the external storage unit," as recited in independent claim 15.

Matsuzaki does not suggest that the display device 30 is connected to an external **storage** unit and does not suggest that the display device 30 is able to both display video data **and** transmit user data to an external storage unit. Hirota discusses that a playlist from the flash memory card 31 can be displayed on the LCD 5, but Hirota does not suggest that the LCD 5 is capable of both displaying video data and transmitting user data to an external storage unit.

Further, at cited col. 9, lines 61-65, Hirota discusses that data can be read from or written to the flash memory card 31, but Hirota does not suggest that the LCD 5 both displays video data and transmits user data to the flash memory card 31. Hirota discusses only that the playlist from the flash memory card 31 is able to be displayed on the LCD 5, but **not** that the LCD 5 is able to transmit the same user data that has been transmitted from the flash memory card 31 or a hard disk back to the flash memory card 31. Further, there is no indication in Hirota that data is transmitted back to the flash memory card 31 or that the LCD 5 is capable of transmitting user data to the flash memory card.

Also, knowing that it is advantageous for a user to view and manipulate user data is not a motivation that suggests a display unit that displays video data and transmits user data to an external storage unit.

Therefore, as the combination of the teachings of Matsuzaki and Hirota does not suggest all the features of independent claim 15, and as the motivations cited do not suggest why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to combine Matsuzaki and Hirota, claim 15 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-15 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/4/07

By: _____

Kari P. Footland
Registration No. 55,187

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501